

SALEM PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

REGULAR MEETING

March 22, 2011

7:00

Present: K. Buckley-Chairperson, R. Amato, D. Bingham, G. Fogarty, R. Savalle, V. Smith, Alt., G. Walter, M. Chinatti, Town Planner/ZEO, Sue Spang, Recording Secretary

Absent: E. Burr, H. McKenney, Alt, Vacancy-Alt.

Guests-none

CALL TO ORDER: K. Buckley called the meeting to order at 7:03 and introduced the members present.

ADDITIONS TO THE AGENDA: None

PUBLIC HEARING None

PETITIONERS: None

PUBLIC COMMENT-None

OLD BUSINESS

1) Working Session: PZC Goals 2011/Priorities-Continued Discussion

M. Chinatti placed a grid on the white board to place individual member's priorities, (See File Copy). The priorities were then averaged out to determine what the Commission feels are the priority rankings. The rankings are in order of importance:

- LID Design-2.71%
- Aquifer Protection-4.42%
- Conservation Design Subdivision-4.71%
- Impervious Surface-4.87%
- Rear Lots/Common Driveways-5.25%

- Rural Character-5.37%
- Open Space-5.71%
- Town Center Zone-6.25%
- Affordable Housing-7%
- Walkable Communities-8.5%

M. Chinatti explained the reasons her rankings of the priorities. She stated she ranked the Town Center Zone as her highest priority because of all the work that has been done so far. She believes the Commission should make a decision one way or the other.

K. Buckley felt Affordable Housing should be addressed by the Commission sooner than later.

G. Fogarty stated she watched the webinar and she is not so sure an Affordable Housing Regulation in Salem is a viable entity. G. Fogarty stated that only 31 out of 169 towns in Connecticut comply with the ten percent goal. The state suggests that any affordable housing be near a town center and public transportation, that it should address water supply and septic, all of which Salem does not have.

G. Walter observed that the priorities fell into three groups and there were some commonalities within the groups.

K. Buckley stated that conservation issues received the highest priorities.

D. Bingham stated the Town Center was brought to the Commission by the Economic Development Commission. He thought it would have been better to call it the Village Center. He stated that if the mixed use were adopted it would allow a house to be used for business on the lower level and living quarters on the upper level.

V. Smith asked if this would be the responsibility of the Town to develop the property (s).

It was explained that a developer would most likely be the one to develop a site or it would be a reuse of an already existing structure.

There was discussion on moving the Town Center up on the priority list; it was the consensus of the Commission to move it up to position five from eight.

It was suggested **Group one**, Aquifer Protection, Conservation Design, LID Design, Impervious surfaces issues would be the Commissions highest priority. **Group two** would be Open Space, Rural Character, and Rear Lots/Common Driveways. **Group three** would be, Walkable Community, Affordable Housing, and Town Center Zone.

K. Buckley asked if the Commission was at a point where the priorities could be put on a calendar to begin action or discussion.

M. Chinatti thought that was possible.

G. Fogarty suggested that Group three be moved to the second priority because the Commission has decided they would like to address the Town Center.

D. Bingham thought the Conservation Design was the most difficult to write and pass regulations for.

V. Smith asked the Commission if the goal of Conservation Design is to limit building or growth in the Town.

D. Bingham explained the objectives of Conservation Designs. He state the Commission does not have the power to either promote or discourage growth.

D. Bingham explained that it is the Commissions purpose to plan and regulate for growth.

K. Buckley will ask M. Chinatti to come up with a project plan for the priorities the Commission has decided on.

NEW BUSINESS

1. Proposed Digital Zoning/Map Discussion and Possible Schedule Public Hearing for Adoption.

M. Chinatti explained the history of the zoning map in use at present. She stated it needs to be updated to show the Riparian Corridor Overlay Zones. She stated Eric Belt, the Town's volunteer GIS person has been working with the map and will present the changes to the Commission. She suggested adopting the new, proposed zoning map at Public Hearing on May 17, 2011.

E. Belt explained the map in use at present was last revised September 28, 1999. He stated that the new plot lines do not always line up with the existing lines on

the map. He stated a photograph was taken of the existing map and the digital was superimposed over the photo. He informed the Commission that the original was hand drawn and not as accurate as the digital information that is available now. He has had to make some decisions as to boundaries. E. Belt pointed out some lots that may present issues as to what zone they are in. He stated there are approximately two dozen lots which have issues.

E. Belt stated he was able to determine some boundaries by digital submission which is the most accurate information. Most people looking at the two maps would not be able to tell the difference.

D. Bingham suggested there be language on the map informing users that the map is accurate for zoning purposes but it is not to be used to determine property lines and that a surveyor is the only person that can confirm boundaries.

It was noted that the RU A Zone is not on the legend.

It was determined the new digital map is not ready to go to Public Hearing until the boundary issues are resolved.

ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS REPORT/INLAND WETLANDS AND CONSERVATION COMMISSION REPORT:

NA

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

NA

PLUS DELTAS: No Plus Deltas were discussed.

K. Buckley stated she is exploring replacing the Plus Deltas portion of the agenda with Administrative Items. She would need to look at the bylaws to see what the standard format is for the Commission's agenda.

The two members who had shown an interest in attending a training session for Economic Development do not need to attend. There are no members of the Salem Economic Development Commission attending.

The "get together" for Boards and Commissions on March 30, was discussed.

G. Walter stated there was a lot of effort on behalf of E. Belt on the proposed digital zoning map.

G. Fogarty suggested exploring the possibility of paying for the expertise on the GIS.

CORRESPONDENCE: None

ADJOURNMENT: M/S/C(Walter/Bingham) to adjourn at 8:56. **Vote:** Approved Unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sue Spang

UNAPPROVED